

REMARKS

The reference discussed during the phone interview was Sgroi (U.S. patent no. 5,357,048).

With regard to claims 1 and 2, Applicant argued that processor 62 of Sgroi does not teach or suggest a low frequency oscillator or a transient generator recited in these claims. The Examiner recognized Applicant's position and indicated that a further review of the Sgroi reference will be necessary to determine if the reference provides the requisite teachings.

Concerning claims 15 and 20, Applicant pointed out that Sgroi fails to disclose the use of incoming control signals comprising MIDI messages. The Examiner agreed with the Applicant on this point.

Applicant further submitted that claim 20 recites the generation of an outgoing real-time MIDI control signal using one or more message conversion methods. Applicant emphasized that Sgroi may well describe the changing of the value of various types of control signals, this reference does not teach or suggest the changing of the type of signal using any of the methods recited in claim 20. The Examiner indicated that a further review of the Sgroi reference would be required to determine if the reference provides the requisite teachings with regard to this feature.


The Examiner concluded the interview by stating that he would withdraw the finality of the Office Action.

Respectfully submitted, **FAX RECEIVED**

LESTER F. LUDWIG

JUN 06 2003

By:


Jeffrey J. Lotspeich
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,737
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Dated: June 6, 2003

THE MAXHAM FIRM
750 'B' STREET, SUITE 3100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101
TELEPHONE: (619) 233-9004
FACSIMILE: (619) 544-1246